

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/736,036	Applicant(s) HOFFMAN, ROGER P.	
	Examiner Robert M. Pond	Art Unit 3625	

All Participants:

(1) Robert M. Pond.

(2) Mr. Philip Weiss, #34,751.

Status of Application: Abandoned

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2006

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Confirmed: no reply to the office action was filed. Mr. Weiss stated he did not receive the office action mailed on 27 December 2005. Mr. Weiss requested a restart.

Subsequent to the interview, the examiner contacted Jeff Smith, SPE AU3625 regarding the restart. Restart was denied. The record shows the office action was mailed on 27 December 2005 and a notice of undelivered mailing on 05 January 2006. When the mailing return was processed (05 January 2006) the address change had not yet been filed. The Change of Address was filed a full 14 days after the undelivered mailing return was processed and the alleged error had not been presented to PTO during the period for response..